

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JEFFREY E. WALKER,

Plaintiff,

v.

KROL, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. [15-cv-05819-HSG](#)

**ORDER REQUIRING DEFENDANTS
TO RESPOND TO PLAINTIFF'S
RENEWED REQUEST TO REOPEN
THIS ACTION**

Re: Dkt. No. 49

Now pending before the Court is Plaintiff's renewed motion to vacate the judgment and to reopen this action. Dkt. No. 49. For the reasons set forth below, the Court ORDERS Defendants to file a response to Plaintiff's motion within twenty-eight (28) days of the date of this order.


On January 28, 2022, Plaintiff filed a motion to vacate or set aside the judgment pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(6) and reopen this action. Dkt. No. 38. On July 29, 2022, the Court denied the motion to vacate, finding that Plaintiff had not demonstrated the requisite "extraordinary circumstances" or "manifest injustice" required to set aside a judgment under Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(6) because *inter alia* Plaintiff failed to explain how his medication prevented him from prosecuting this action and did not address how he was able to pursue multiple actions in state court despite being forcibly medicated or how why he did not pursue this action upon no longer being medicated. *See generally* Dkt. No. 48.

Plaintiff has since filed a pleading which the Court construes as a renewed motion to vacate or set aside the judgment pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(6) and reopen this action. Dkt. No. 49. In this pleading, he provides further details about how his medication prevented him from prosecuting this action and why he did not seek to reopen this action until January 2022. Plaintiff alleges that he was involuntarily medicated through 2020 and that the medication rendered him

1 incapable of pursuing any litigation. He further alleges that once the medication was discontinued,
2 he had limited time to pursue litigation because of COVID-related limitations on access to the law
3 library and mandatory attendance at daily hospital groups, so he prioritized other time-sensitive
4 litigation. *See generally* Dkt. No. 49. Because Plaintiff has addressed the deficiencies identified
5 in the Court's July 29, 2022 order denying the motion to vacate and reopen, the Court ORDERS
6 Defendants to file a response to Plaintiff's renewed motion to vacate and reopen within twenty-
7 eight (28) days of the date of this order.

8 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

9 Dated: 10/26/2022

10 
11 HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.
12 United States District Judge
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28